

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 THERESA BROOKE,  
11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 NOBLE HOUSE HOTELS & RESORTS  
14 LP,  
15 Defendant.

No. 2:24-cv-00356-JAK (PDx)

**ORDER RE TO SHOW CAUSE RE:  
SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION  
OVER STATE-LAW CLAIM**

1 Based on a review of the Complaint (Dkt. 1), the following determinations are  
2 made:

3 The Complaint alleges violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42  
4 U.S.C. §§ 12101 et seq. (the “ADA”), and the Unruh Civil Rights Act (the “Unruh  
5 Act”), Cal. Civ. Code §§ 51–53. Supplemental jurisdiction is the basis for the state-law  
6 claim. Dkt. 1 ¶ 6.

7 District courts may exercise “supplemental jurisdiction over all other claims that  
8 are so related to claims in the action within such original jurisdiction that they form part  
9 of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution.” 28  
10 U.S.C. § 1367(a). This “is a doctrine of discretion, not of plaintiff’s right.” *United Mine*  
11 *Workers v. Gibbs*, 383 U.S. 715, 726 (1966). “In order to decide whether to exercise  
12 jurisdiction over pendent state law claims, a district court should consider . . . at every  
13 stage of the litigation, the values of judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and  
14 comity.” *Nishimoto v. Federman-Bachrach & Assocs.*, 903 F.2d 709, 715 (9th Cir. 1990)  
15 (citation omitted).

16 In 2012, California imposed heightened pleading requirements for Unruh Act  
17 claims. Cal. Civ. Code § 55.52(a)(1); Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 425.50(a). In 2015,  
18 California also imposed a “high-frequency litigant fee” for plaintiffs and law firms that  
19 have brought large numbers of construction-related accessibility claims. Cal. Gov’t Code  
20 § 70616.5. As detailed in previous orders by this Court and other district courts in  
21 California, these reforms addressed the small number of plaintiffs and counsel who bring  
22 a significant percentage of construction-related accessibility claims. *E.g.*, *Whitaker v.*  
23 *RCP Belmont Shore LLC*, No. LA CV19-09561 JAK (JEMx), 2020 WL 3800449, at \*6–  
24 8 (Mar. 30, 2020); *Garibay v. Rodriguez*, No. 2:18-cv-09187-PA (AFMx), 2019 WL  
25 5204294, at \*1–6 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 27, 2019). These statutes impose special requirements  
26 for construction-related accessibility claims brought by high-frequency plaintiffs  
27 pursuant to the Unruh Act. Because accepting supplemental jurisdiction over such claims  
28

1 would permit high-frequency plaintiffs to side-step those state-law requirements by  
2 pursuing the claims in a federal forum, many district courts, including this one, have  
3 declined to exercise such jurisdiction. *E.g.*, *Whitaker*, 2020 WL 3800449, at \*6–8;  
4 *Garibay*, 2019 WL 5204294, at \*1–6.

5 A review of the docket in this District shows that, in the one-year period preceding  
6 the filing of the Complaint, Plaintiff has filed more than ten actions in which she has  
7 advanced construction-related accessibility claims. In a California Superior Court,  
8 Plaintiff would be deemed a high-frequency litigant. Therefore, “California’s recent  
9 legislative enactments confirm that the state has a substantial interest in this case.” *Perri*  
10 *v. Thrifty Payless*, No. 2:19-CV-07829-CJC (SKx), 2019 WL 7882068, at \*2 (C.D. Cal.  
11 Oct. 8, 2019).

12 In light of the foregoing, Plaintiff is **ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE** why the  
13 Court should not decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claim.  
14 Plaintiff shall file a response to this Order to Show Cause, not to exceed ten pages, on or  
15 before February 6, 2024. In responding to this Order to Show Cause, Plaintiff shall  
16 identify the amount of statutory damages Plaintiff seeks to recover. Plaintiff shall also  
17 present a declaration, signed under penalty of perjury, providing the evidence necessary  
18 for the Court to determine if Plaintiff meets the definition of a “high-frequency litigant”  
19 as defined in Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 425.50(b)(1) & (2). Failure to file a timely response  
20 to this Order to Show Cause may result in the dismissal of the state-law claim without  
21 prejudice by declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over them, pursuant to 28  
22 U.S.C. § 1367(c). Defendant may also file a response to this Order to Show Cause, not to  
23 exceed ten pages, on or before February 13, 2024. Upon receipt of the response(s), the  
24 matter will be taken under submission, and a written order will issue.

25  
26  
27 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

1  
2 Dated: January 23, 2024

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
3 John A. Kronstadt  
4 United States District Judge  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28